

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.19683 of 2000

-

Dt:23.08.2007

Between:

V.Mallreddy.

.. Petitioner

and

Vice-chairman and another.

.. Respondents

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.19683 of 2000

ORDER:

-

The A.P.S.R.T.C invited applications from the intending entrepreneurs, for hiring their busses on the route Manthani-Hyderabad. The petitioner submitted his application and in the process, he furnished the particulars of the vehicle, which he proposed to operate. After obtaining permission, the petitioner had produced a bus with different numbers of chasis and engine. The Regional Manager, APSRTC, Karimnagar, second respondent herein issued proceedings dated 02.06.2000 requiring the petitioner to produce the vehicle with the chasis and engine numbers submitted in the application. The petitioner challenges the same.

It is contended that the petitioner took invoice for the vehicle with chasis No.412 065 BZZ 103415 and engine No.00 B62 136138, but, at the time of taking delivery, defects were noticed. Thereupon, the dealer is said to have delivered the vehicle with chasis No.412 060 BZZ 104638 and engine No.00 B62 137523. The vehicle supplied was registered as AP.15V/1334. The petitioner contends that once the vehicle with the same description is produced, there was no basis for the respondents in taking objections.

Respondents filed a counter affidavit, stating that the petitioner had violated the conditions, subject to which he was granted permission.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents.

The dispute between the petitioner and the respondents arose, on account of the discrepancy in the number of chasis and engine of the vehicle, which was proposed to be placed at the disposal of the respondents and which was actually placed. For all practical purposes, this controversy paled into insignificance, in view of the interim orders, dated 18.10.2000, passed by this Court in

W.P.M.P.No.24943 of 2000, whereunder, the second respondent was directed to accept the bus bearing No.AP.15/V. 1334. With this, the grievance of the petitioner stood redressed. It is a different matter that the petitioner did not produce that vehicle also.

Hence, the writ petition is dismissed as infructuous. If the petitioner is entitled to be refunded any amount, it shall be open to him to make representation to the respondents. There shall be no order as to costs.

23.08.2007

JSU